IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on: 10.9.2015 & Pronounced on: 27.10.2015

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
and
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE T.MATHIVANAN

Writ Petition Nos.23670 of 2014 & 12475 of 2015

Don Bosco Higher Secondary School
rep. by its Correspondent
Rev. Fr. Pathiaraj SDB
No.130, Madhavaram High Road
Perambur, Chennai 600 008. ...Petitioner in WP.No.23670/14

G.Devarajan ...Petitioner in WP. No.12475/15
& R6 in WP No.23670/14

Vs.

The Government of Tamil Nadu
rep. by the Secretary
Department of School Education
Fort St. George
Chennai 600 009.

The Director of School Education
DPI Campus, College Road
Chennai 600 006.

The Chief Educational Officer
Panagal Building
Anna Salai
Chennai 600 015.

The District Education Officer
Chennai (North) Egmore
Chennai 600 008.

The Private School Fees Determining Committee
Rep. by Special Officer
DPI Campus, College Road
Chennai 600 006. .. R1 to R5 in both WPs.

Petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a (a) writ of Certiorari calling for the records, pertaining to the impugned order dated 13.8.2014 on the file of the fifth respondent and quash the same, in respect of the petitioner, and

(b) writ of Mandamus directing the fifth respondent to take necessary action and conduct enquiry about the excess fees collected by the Don Bosco Higher Secondary School, No.130, Madhavaram High Road, Perambur, Chennai 600 011, for the period from 2014 to 2015 academic year.

For Petitioner in WP No.23670/14 : Dr.Fr.A.Xavier Arulraj

For Petitioner in WP No.12475/15 & R6 in WP No.23670/14 : Mr.G.Devarajan Petitioner-in-Person

For Respondents 1-5 : Mr.P.Sanjai Gandhi, Addl.G.P.

O R D E R

While one writ petition is by the Management of a Christian Minority School challenging an order passed by the Private Schools Fees Determination Committee, the second writ petition is filed by the parent of a former student of the same School seeking the issue of Mandamus to direct the Special Officer of the Private School Fees Determination Committee to take necessary action and conduct an enquiry about the excess fees collected by the School for the period 2014-15.

2. We have heard Dr.Fr.A.Xavier Arulraj, learned counsel appearing for the Management of the School, Mr.G.Devarajan, petitioner appearing in person in W.P.No.12475 of 2015 and Mr.P.Sanjai Gandhi, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the Government.

3. Since one writ petition is by the Management of the School and the other writ petition is by the parent of the former student of the same School, we shall refer to the School as the petitioner School and the petitioner in the other writ petition as the Parent, for the purpose of easy reference.

4. The petitioner School was established in 1963 by a Society known as South Indian Salesian Society, formed for the welfare of a Catholic Christian Minority Community.

5. The petitioner School is one of the several educational institutions run by the same educational agency. The educational agency has established and is running about 14 Primary Schools, 5 High Schools, 7 Higher Secondary Schools, 2 Anglo-Indian Schools, 3 Teacher Training Institutes, 9 Matriculation Schools, 3 CBSE Schools, 4 Arts and Science Colleges, 2 Professional Colleges, 2 Agricultural Colleges, 3 B.Ed. Colleges, 2 Community Colleges, 16 Technical Institutions, 6 Orphanages, 10 Boarding/Hostels, 5 Homes for the Street Children, 4 Homes for the Aged, 5 Youth Centres and 11 Social Work Centres.

6. The petitioner School claims that it runs purely on non-profit basis. Interestingly, the petitioner School is affiliated to the State Board and it is actually Tamil Medium School, which has survived the onslaught of English Education and CBSE system.

7. Way back in 1964, the Government introduced two types of Grant under G.O.Ms.No.581, Education dated 22.4.1964, for aiding School Education in the State. The first type of Grant was known as the Teaching Grant, which took care of payment of salaries to teaching and non-teaching staff. The second type of Grant was known as the Maintenance Grant, intended to take care of the development of infrastructure.

8. However, by Tamil Nadu Act 11 of 1999, the Tamil Nadu Recognised Private Schools Regulation Act, 1973 was amended. By this amendment, Section 14-A was inserted. Section 14-A stipulated that any private school established and any class or course of instruction opened in such private school on or after the commencement of the academic year 1991-92 will not be entitled to the grand-in-aid. Even in respect of private schools in existence as on the date of commencement of the academic year 1991-92, grant-in-aid was made not payable, in respect of any class or course of instruction opened on or after the date of commencement of the academic year 1991-92.

9. In other words, the Government solely started withdrawing the investment made in the development of human resources in the State. This amendment was upheld by a Division Bench of this Court in Maria Grace Rural Middle School v. The Government of Tamil Nadu [2006 (5) CTC 193].

10. The effect of the amendment was three fold, namely (a) the Maintenance Grant was fully stopped, (b) the grand for non-teaching staff was also fully stopped, and (c) the grant-in-aid for teaching staff, was partly withdrawn, in the sense that only those course for which approval had already been given the Teaching Grant was continued.

11. As a consequence, the Management of Schools had to outsource the tasks hitherto performed by non-teaching staff. The expenditure incurred for outsourcing these tasks and the expenditure incurred for engaging the services of teachers over and above those appointed as against sanctioned posts had to necessarily come out of the funds available with the Parents Teachers Association and the fees collected from students. But, after the advent of the Tamil Nadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act, 2009, the Government introduced fees structure for both Government Aided Private Schools and unaided Schools. To begin with, the Government prohibited the collection of special fees, under G.O.Ms.No.110 dated 29.5.2008. By a subsequent Government Order, the Government provided for regulation of collection of fees by Schools in Tamil Nadu.

12. The Parent, who is the petitioner in the second writ petition, lodged a complaint with the Private Schools Fee Determination Committee on 27.5.2014, contending that the petitioner School was collecting excess fees. The Special Officer of the Committee directed the Chief Educational Officer to conduct an enquiry into the said complaint. The Chief Educational Officer called upon the petitioner School to produce all the records, bills and vouchers, which the petitioner School did.

13. Thereafter, the Chief Educational Officer submitted a report on 30.6.2014 recording a very vague and superficial finding that the School had collected excess fees. Based upon such a report, the Fee Committee passed an order on 13.8.2014, directing the Director of School Education to initiate necessary action to get the excess fee allegedly collected by the petitioner School refunded, by the method stipulated in Tamil Nadu Act 22 of 2009. Action taken report was also directed to be submitted to the Fee Determination Committee within three months.

14. Aggrieved by the said order dated 13.8.2014 passed by the Private Schools Fee Determination Committee, the Management of the School has come up with W.P.No.23670 of 2014. Notice was ordered in the writ petition on 02.9.2014 and an interim order to maintain status quo was also passed.



15. Thereafter, the Parent came up with a second writ petition contending that the petitioner School was collecting fees, far in excess of what is prescribed by the Government Orders and that the total amount collected by the School in excess of what is prescribed, worked out to Rs.3,87,50,000/- and that though the Parent gave a criminal complaint and came up with a petition under Section 482 of the Code for a direction to register the complaint, the same was dismissed with liberty to

approach the Fee Fixation Committee. After approaching the Fee Fixation Committee, the Parent has come up with the second writ petition W.P.No.12475 of 2015 seeking a Mandamus to direct the Special Officer of the Committee to take action and conduct enquiry about the excess fees collected by the School for the period from 2014-15.

16. It would be appropriate to deal first with the writ petition filed by the School, since the outcome of the said writ petition may determine the fate of the writ petition filed by the Parent. Therefore, we shall take up the writ petition of the School first.

17. As we have stated earlier, the writ petition filed by the School challenges an order passed by the Fee Determination Committee. The circumstances under which the Fee Determination Committee passed the order dated 13.8.2014 is required to be noted.

18. It appears that the Parent first lodged a complaint with the Chairman of the Fee Determination Committee on 27.5.2014, on the ground that the School was collecting fee in excess of what was stipulated by the Government. Simultaneously, he also lodged a complaint with the Commissioner of Police on 24.6.2014. The Parent also filed a complaint in Crl.O.P.No.18641 of 2014 seeking a direction under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to investigate into the said complaint. But, the said petition was dismissed by a learned Judge on 18.7.2014 with liberty to the Parent to pursue his remedies before the Fee Fixation Committee.

19. In the meantime, the Chief Educational Officer conducted an inspection on 30.6.2014 to find out the veracity of the claim made by the Parent, who is now before us, as well as two other Parents who had also given similar complaints.

20. On 30.6.2014, the petitioner School presented all the records, receipts, bills and vouchers along with bank statements for the inspection of the Chief Educational Officer.

21. Thereafter, the Chief Educational Officer submitted an enquiry report on the very same date, namely 30.6.2014.

22. In the two page report submitted by the Chief Educational Officer, he had recorded the following findings:

(i) that 2108 students were studying in the School;

(ii) that 58 teaching and 5 non-teaching staff were employed with the Teaching Grant paid by the Government;

(iii) that 9 teachers and 9 non-teaching staff appointed by the Management out of the funds generated by them were also employed;

(iv) that there are 39 class rooms with sufficient infrastructure;

(v) that there were 50 toilets which were well maintained;

(vi) that sufficient drinking water facility was made available to the students; and

(vii) that for encouraging sports, there was a huge playground with provisions for playing food ball, volley ball and basket ball, etc.

23. Insofar as the collection of fee was concerned, two page report of the Chief Educational Officer dated 30.6.2014 presented the fee structure for students of Class VI to XII, both in Tamil Medium and English Medium in a tabular statement as follows:

| CLASS | ENGLISH MEDIUM | TAMIL MEDIUM |
|---|---|---|
| Class VI | Rs.9,800/- | Rs. 3,600/- |
| Class VII | Rs.9,850/- | Rs.3,700/- |
| Class VIII | Rs.9,900/- | Rs.3,800/- |
| Class XI | Rs.9,950/- | Rs.4,400/- |
| Class X | Rs.9,350/- | Rs.4,200/- |
| Class XI | A - Rs.13,700/-<br>B - Rs.13,900/-<br>C - Rs.13,400/-<br>D - Rs.12,700/- | E - Rs.7,750/- |
| Class XII | A - Rs.10,300/-<br>B - Rs.11,500/-<br>C - Rs.11,000/-<br>D - Rs.9,900/- | E - Rs.7,400/- |

24. After presenting the above tabular statement, the report of the Chief Educational Officer concluded that the School had collected a total amount of Rs.1,57,01,810/- towards fee and that the same had also been remitted into six different bank accounts. The report further indicated that the Headmaster of the School presented details of all the expenditure and that tuition fee to the extent of Rs.3,76,250/- collected from English Medium Schools had been remitted into the Government account on 24.3.2014.

25. After providing all the information as indicated in the preceding paragraphs, the report concluded that the petitioner School had collected fee in excess, for the academic year 2013-14.

26. It appears that the above report of the Chief Educational Officer was made available to the Fee Determination Committee on 04.7.2014. Thereafter, the proceedings before the Committee appeared to have been adjourned to 25.7.2014, 05.8.2014 and 12.8.2014, for the production of the copy of the order passed in the Criminal Original Petition filed by the Parent. The complainant produced the copy on 12.8.2014. Immediately, the Committee passed an order dated 13.8.2014 impugned in this writ petition. The operative portion of the order of the Fee Determination Committee, impugned in the first writ petition, reads as follows:

> "As that order contains no further direction, the Committee is proceeding further by accepting the CEO's report dated 30.6.2014 and recommending for necessary action to be initiated by the Director of School Education for refund of excess fee collected by the School during the year 2013-2014 by the method as prescribed in the Tamil Nadu Act 22 of 2009, especially Section 9 of the said Act for the purpose of refund of excess fee collected during 2013-2014, after adhering to the legal formalities as prescribed in the Act, and make a report of result of action taken within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. With this recommendation, the complaint is disposed of accordingly."

27. The above order of the Fee Determination Committee is challenged by the petitioner School primarily on the ground that the impugned order of the Committee is completely bereft of any reasoning and that the same had been passed in violation of the principles of natural justice, without affording adequate opportunity to the School. It is also the contention of the petitioner School that the impugned order of the Fee Determination Committee proceeds solely on the basis of the report of the Chief Educational Officer dated 30.6.2014, which does not even take into account the expenditure incurred by the petitioner School. Moreover, both the Chief Educational Officer as well as the Fee Determination Committee have completely failed to take note of the fact that the Maintenance Grant for the School has been completely stopped and even the Teaching Grant is provided only partly and that therefore, the authorities were obliged to take note of the cost involved in maintaining the infrastructure. In any case, it is contended by the petitioner School that Act 22 of 2009 as well as the Rules framed therein speak only about admission fee and not about any other fee and that except a bar for the collection of special fee, there is no prohibition for the collection of certain items, commensurate with the quality of services rendered.

28. We have carefully considered the above submissions.

29. It is true, as contended by Dr.Fr.A.Xavier Arulraj that the Fee Determination Committee, in its impugned order, had not gone into the question of collection of excess fee, independently. In the order dated 13.8.2014, impugned in the first writ petition, the Committee has slowly gone by the finding contained in the report of the Chief Educational Officer. Therefore, we are obliged to test the correctness of the report of the Chief Educational Officer dated 30.6.2014, to see whether the order of the Committee is right or not.

30. A look at the report of the Chief Educational Officer dated 30.6.2014 would show that it is patently flawed. The report just contains two parts, the first part giving the list of infrastructure available in the School with the number of students and the teaching and non-teaching staff and the second part contains the details of fee collected from Tamil Medium and English Medium students. With these two sets of information, the Chief Educational Officer has come to the conclusion that the petitioner School is guilty of collecting an amount in excess of the fee fixed. The report does not indicate what is the actual fee fixed and how much the petitioner School is entitled to collect from all the students put together. Only if the amount of actual fee fixed and the total amount collected that the School was entitled to collect are indicated, it is possible to find out what is the excess fee collected. In the absence of such a basic essential fact, we do not know how the petitioner School can be said to have collected excess fee.

31. In addition to the above, the report of the Chief Educational Officer takes note of the fact that the petitioner School had incurred lot of expenditure. After having perused the relevant records and registers, the Chief Educational Officer has failed to record the total expenditure incurred by the School, to find out as to whether the fee collected from all the students was in excess of or equivalent to or fell short of the total expenditure incurred by the School. The petitioner has claimed that the School is run on non-profit basis. Moreover, the pupil strength in Tamil Medium has started dwindling so rapidly even in the other Schools that many Schools have closed down Tamil Medium sections. But, braving the adverse climate in Society, the petitioner School has been able to continue to run Tamil Medium Sections. Therefore, without taking note of the actual expenditure incurred by the petitioner School, the Chief Educational Officer ought not to have submitted the report. Hence, on the face of it, the report of the Chief Educational Officer dated 30.6.2014 is flawed. As a consequence, the order

of the Fee Determination Committee, which proceeds solely on the basis of the Chief Educational Officer's report is also flawed.

32. Though the above finding is sufficient to set at naught the impugned proceedings, we would also examine the question from the legal perspective.

33. Tamil Nadu Act 22 of 2009 was enacted with the object of regulating the collection of fees by Schools in the State of Tamil Nadu. The Act divides the Schools existing in the State of Tamil Nadu into the following categories: (i) Government Schools, (ii) Aided Schools, (iii) Private Schools other than aided Schools, and (iv) Schools providing or imparting religious instructions alone, but not any other instructions.

34. The Act seeks to cover only the Government Schools, Aided Schools and Private Schools other than Aided Schools. While Sub-section (1) of Section 3 seeks to prohibit the collection of excess fees by Government Schools and aided Schools, Sub-section (2) of Section 3 seeks to prohibit the collection of excess fees by private Schools other than aided Schools. The power of fixation of appropriate fee is vested with the State Government, under Section 4 of the Act, insofar as the Government Schools and Aided Schools are concerned. Similarly, the power of fixation of the appropriate fee is vested with the Fee Determination Committee, insofar as private Schools other than the aided Schools are concerned.

35. In other words, the Fee Determination Committee is not empowered to determine the fee leviable by a Government School or Aided School. Section 4 confers power only upon the State Government to fix the fee for admission of pupils to any standard or course of study in Government Schools and Aided Schools. It is only in respect of private Schools other than Aided Schools that the Fee Determination Committee is vested with the power under Section 6, to determine the fee, based upon the location of the School, available infrastructure, expenditure on administration and maintenance, reasonable surplus referred for the growth and development of the private Schools and any other factors.

36. A careful look at the Scheme of the Act would also indicate one more aspect. Under Section 6 of the Act, a detailed procedure is prescribed for the Fee Determination Committee to determine the fee leviable by a private School. There are inbuilt safeguards, such as an opportunity of hearing to the School concerned, a revision of the fee so fixed once in three years etc. But, insofar as Government Schools and Aided Schools are concerned, no such procedure is prescribed in Section 4 and

no opportunity of hearing is provided to an aided School.

37. As a matter of fact, the expression "aided School" is defined in Section 2(b) of the Act, to mean a School receiving any sum of money as aid out of the State funds. There is no dispute about the fact that after insertion of Section 14-A into the Tamil Nadu Recognised Private Schools Regulation Act, by Act 11 of 1999, the Government has completely stopped the Maintenance Grant and has also curtailed the quantum of Teaching Grant. Nevertheless, a School generating its own funds to sustain even the sections or courses which do not receive any grant-in-aid, would come within the definition of the expression "aided School" under Section 2(b), in view of the expanded meaning given to the expression. As a consequence, the petitioner School would come within the purview of the expression "aided School" under Section 2(b) of the Act. Therefore, the Fee Determination Committee cannot fix the fee leviable by the petitioner School. This is why the Fee Determination Committee has relied upon the report of the Chief Educational Officer.

38. But, it is doubtful if the Fee Determination Committee, which does not have the power to determine the fee leviable by a Government School or an aided School, would still have the power to oversee the functioning of the Government Schools and aided Schools. This can be well understood by having a look at Sections 6 and 7 of the Act.

39. While Section 6 deals with the procedure to be followed by the Fee Determination Committee for fixing the fee leviable by a private School, Section 7 deals with the powers and functions of the Fee Fixation Committee. Sub-sections (1) to (4) of Section 7 divides the powers and functions of the Fee Determination Committee into four categories. Sub-section (4) of Section 7 empowers the Committee to regulate its own procedures and it confers upon the Committee all the powers of the Civil Code under the Code of Civil Procedure. Since it is not relevant for our discussion, we do not deal with Sub-section (4). Similarly, Sub-section (3) relates to the power of the Committee to hear complaints against the Schools affiliated to the Central Board of Secondary Education and hence, we do not propose to deal with Sub-section (3). This leaves us with Sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 7. The power conferred upon the Fee Determination Committee under Sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 7 can be summarised s follows:

(i) to determine the fee to be collected by private Schools;

(ii) to hear complaints with regard to the collection of excess fee by a private School, aided School or Government

School and to recommend appropriate action against such School by the competent authority;

(iii) to call upon private Schools to place the proposed fee structure with all relevant documents and books of accounts; and

(iv) to verify and approve the fee structure proposed by a private School.

40. Therefore, it is clear that though the Fee Determination Committee has no role to play in the matter of fixation of fee in respect of a Government School or an aided School, the Committee is conferred with a limited jurisdiction to hear complaints with regard to the collection of excess fees by Government Schools and aided Schools, under Clause (b) of Sub-section (1) of Section 7, which reads as follows:

> "Section 7(1)- The powers and functions of the Committee shall be-
>
> (a) ....
>
> (b) to hear complaints with regard to collection of fee in excess of the fee determined by it or fixed by the Government, as the case may be. If the committee, after obtaining the evidence and explanation from the management of the private school or aided school concerned or from the Government school, comes to the conclusion that the private school or the Government school or aided school has collected fee in excess of the fee determined by the committee or fixed by the Government, as the case may be, it shall recommend to the appropriate competent authority for the cancellation of the recognition or approval, as the case may be, of the private school or aided school or for any other course of action as it deems fit in respect of the private school or Government school or aided school."

41. But, it is seen from the impugned order of the Fee Determination Committee that the Committee did not follow the procedure prescribed by Section 7(1)(b). Therefore, we are of the considered view that the impugned order of the Fee Determination Committee is liable to be set aside.

42. Though Dr.Fr.A.Xavier Arulraj made elaborate submissions on the applicability of the very provisions of the Tamil Nadu Recognised Private Schools Regulation Act to minority educational institutions, we do not think that we need to examine the same in this writ petition. However, three Government Orders that have some bearing upon the fee that could be levied by an aided School, need be taken note of. By the

first order in G.O.Ms.No.110, School Education dated 29.5.2008, which was issued more than a year before the date of commencement of Tamil Nadu Act 22 of 2009, the Government cancelled the Special Fee payable under different heads by students studying in Tamil Medium or English Medium in standards 6 to 12. The various heads of Special Fee that were cancelled by the said Government Order are given in paragraph 2(i) of the said Government Order. In other words, G.O.Ms.No.110 dated 29.5.2008 did not prescribe the fee that could be levied by an aided School. It merely gave the items of Special Fee under 14 different heads, that were levied till then as special fees and sought to cancel the same.

43. Under the next Government Order G.O.Ms.No.218, School Education dated 08.11.2008, the Government allotted an amount of Rs.21.40 Crores to the School Education Department, to compensate the Government Schools for the loss that they suffered on account of the cancellation of Special Fees under G.O.Ms.No.110. This Government Order did not take note of the aided Schools and the aided Schools were not compensated.

44. By the next Government Order G.O.Ms.No.203, School Education dated 23.7.2010, the Government permitted aided Schools to fill up vacancies in non-teaching posts, such as watchman, gardener, waterman, scavenger, etc. by outsourcing the tasks. Other than these three Orders, no other Order is brought to our notice, whereby the fee to be levied by an aided School was fixed by the Government.

45. As we have indicated earlier, the provisions of Section 7(1)(b) will come into operation, for the purpose of hearing complaints against an aided School, only after the Government had fixed the fee under Section 4. A Government Order, such as the one in G.O.Ms.No.110, which merely cancelled the levy of special fees in respect of 14 different heads, is not an order under Section 4 of the Act, so as to enable the Committee to invoke Section 7(1)(b).

46. Therefore, we are of the considered view that neither the jurisdiction assumed by the Committee, nor the procedure followed by the Committee is in accordance with law. Hence, W.P.No.23670 of 2014 is allowed, setting aside the order of the Committee.

47. Coming to the next writ petition filed by the Parent, it is seen that the said writ petition proceeds on the presumption that the petitioner School has collected fees in excess of what was prescribed by the Government. When no Government Order passed in exercise of the power conferred by Section 4 of the

Act is brought to our notice to show that some amount was already fixed by the Government as leviable by an aided School, we do not know how the allegation that the petitioner School collected fees in excess, could be accepted.

48. In the counter affidavit filed by the Special Officer of the Fee Determination Committee, he has made a reference to the proceedings of the Director of School Education bearing No.23343/G2/E2/2014 dated 05.6.2014. It is stated in the counter affidavit filed by the Special Officer of the Fee Determination Committee that as per the said letter of the Director of School Education, the petitioner School was entitled to collect only Rs.200/- from the students studying in Classes 6 to 8, Rs.250/- from the students studying in Classes 9 and 10 and Rs.500/- from students studying in Classes 11 and 12 and that no fee shall be collected from students studying in Tamil Medium.

49. But, the counter affidavit filed by the Special Officer of the Fee Determination Committee failed to take note of the fact that the Director of School Education is not competent to determine the fee leviable by an aided School. The power to fix the fee is conferred only upon the State Government under Section 4 of the Act. Therefore, in the absence of a Government Order issued under Section 4 of the Act fixing the fee leviable by an aided School, such as the petitioner herein, it was not possible either for the Chief Educational Officer or for the Fee Determination Committee or even for this Court to come to a conclusion that the petitioner School violated the provisions of Tamil Nadu Act 22 of 2009. Hence, the Mandamus, as sought by the Parent, cannot be issued. Therefore, W.P.No.12475 of 2015 is dismissed.

In the result, W.P.No.23670 of 2014 is allowed. W.P.No.12475 of 2015 is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, M.P.Nos.1 of 2014 and 1 of 2015 in W.P.No.23670 of 2014 are closed and M.P.No.1 of 2015 in W.P.No.12475 of 2015 is dismissed.

Sd/
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR(CS-IV)

/TRUE COPY/

SUB-ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

kpl

To

1. The Secretary to Government of TamilNadu
Department of School Education
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.

2. The Director of School Education
DPI Campus, College Road
Chennai 600 006.

3. The Chief Educational Officer
Panagal Building
Anna Salai
Chennai 600 015.

4. The District Education Officer
Chennai (North) Egmore
Chennai 600 008.

5. The Special Officer
Private School Fees Determining Committee
DPI Campus, College Road
Chennai 600 006.

+2 CC to MR.G.Devarajan, Party in Person. SR.NO.57966 & 57967.

+3 CC to Dr.Fr.A.Xavier Arulraj Advocate. SR.NO.58860

W.P.Nos.23670 of 2014 &
12475 of 2015.

CO-SV
JD 15/12/2015